DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 769 SO 008 058

AUTHOR	Grandstaff, Marvin
TITLE	Alternatives in Education: A Summary View of Research and Analysis on the Concept of Non-Formal Education. Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education. Team Reports.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for International Studies in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	91p.; For related documents, see SO 008 059-064
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Developing Nations; Economic Disadvantagement; *Educational Alternatives; *Educational Economics; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Educational Research; Evaluation; Individual Needs; Manpower Development; *Nonformal Education; Poverty Programs; Relevance (Education); Training

ABSTRACT

The concept of nonformal education (NFE) is explored in a series of team reports. These reports fulfill the first objective, knowledge building, of a program that will culminate in the application of the knowledge about NFE in developing areas of the world through consultation, technical assistance, workshops, and information dissemination. Cross-disciplinary team working papers and semiweekly debates are the basis for delineating the future role of NFE in development planning as described in this series. This team report integrates the following generalizations that emerge in the individual studies. The concept of NFE is dependent on context and defined by the form of sponsorship and pedagogical format used. For national development, the impact of the concept of nonformal education is the expansion of educational alternatives and a sharpened comprehension of the world of out-of-school learning. In practice NFE is a response to a demand originating with the learners, such as a need for occupational education or education designed for rural settings. Planning for NFE, within a concrete situation and specific demands, facilitates a systematic look at formal education and the development of more equitable formats for financing. (JH)

ED100769

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education

ALTERNATIVES IN EDUCATION:

A Summary View of Research and Analysis on the Concept of Non-Formal Education

By Marvin Grandstaff
Associate Professor of Education
Michigan State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 008 058

Institute for International Studies in Education
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

These Studies were produced
with the cooperation of the
Agency for International Development
Department of State, Washington, D.C.
1974

00004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		i
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AS A CONCEPT	6
	Administrative Affiliation	7
	Pedagogical Style	9
	Function	10
	Clients	11
	Reward Systems	12
	Cultural Congruence	13
III	THE VISUALIZATION OF POSSIBILITIES	16
	The World of Out-of-School Learning	17
	Changing Goals of Development	20
	Distribution	21
	Strategic Uses of Formal and Non-Formal Education	23
	Flexibility	24
	Formative Evaluation	26
	Financing and Accounting	28
	Teachers	30
	Comprehensive Learning Systems	31
	Summary	33
IV	THE FACES OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION	35
	Responsive Education	39
	Comprehensive Development Plans	41
	The Context of Poverty	44
	Occupational Education	52
	Contexts of Rapid and Recent Change	55
	Existing Structures	56
	Ad Hoc Education	59
	Supportive Education	60
	Summary	61
V	PLANNING FOR NON-FORMAL EDUCATION	63
	Two Views of Planning	65
VI	PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR NON-FORMAL EDUATION	73
	Mobilizing an Old Resource	73
	Education that Serves	75
	Complements: Formal and Non-Formal Education	76
	Educational Costs	78
VII	CONCLUSION	80

FOREWORD

The Michigan State University Program of Studies in Non-formal Education, made possible by the Agency for International Development, has two primary objectives: to build a systematic knowledge base about non-formal education, and to apply knowledge through consultation, technical assistance, workshops, and the distribution of useful materials in developing areas of the world.

This volume is a summation of a series of Team Reports directed at the first objective, knowledge building. The series consists of the final statements of nine teams of faculty members and research fellows, each working on a separate aspect of non-formal education for a sustained period of time. The reports range widely over non-formal education. They deal with its history, its categories and strategies, economics, and learning. Other reports make comparisons among country programs, survey case studies, examine the feasibility of designing non-formal education models, look at administrative alternatives and draw plans for participant training in non-formal education.

The teams were cross-disciplinary in composition, representing such areas as economics, labor and industrial relations, political science, public administration, agricultural economics, sociology and education. Together, members of the teams produced nearly one hundred working papers, many of which were shared and debated in three series of

semi-weekly seminars for all project participants. The working papers, copies of which are available upon request, provide the basic ideas for the reports in this series.

In the interest of the freest possible exploration each team was encouraged to range widely over its domain and to develop its own set of conclusions and recommendations. Coordination was achieved through the common seminars and the exchange of data and experience.

In line with our first objective (knowledge building) the papers in this series are conceptual in nature. In the pursuit of knowledge, however, we have tried to keep one question steadily before us: what assistance does this knowledge provide to those whose primary concern is with action--the planning and implementing of non-formal education at the level of practice? That question isn't easily answered. At best our knowledge is partial and it needs the experience demension to make it more complete. For thought and action are not antitheticla; they are necessary complements. One of our hopes is that this series of reports may help to stimulate further dialogue between those who approach the subject of non-formal education from a conceptual point of view and those whose questions and problems arise in the exigencies of practice.

What is the role of non-formal education in future development planning? As these reports suggest, it is probably great, ans will be even greater through future time. The limitations of formal schooling are coming to be better

06007

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

understood. As the Faure report concludes, the school "will be less and less in a position to claim the education functions in society as its special perogative. All sectors--public administration, industry, communications, transportation must take part in promoting education. Local and national communities are in themselves eminently education institutions".

The non-formal education component of most societies is strong, indeed frequently vigorous, and fully capable of further development and use. It is estimated that roughly half of the present educational effort in the developing countries is in the non-formal sector. Collectively, these programs exhibit characteristics indispensible to development. For example, they tend to arise in response to immediate needs; they are usually related to action and use; they tend to be short term rather than long; they have a variety of sponsors, both public and private; and they tend to be responsive to local community requirements. More importantly non-formal education shows strong potential for getting at the human condition of those most likely to be excluded from the formal schools, the poor, the isolated, the rural, the illiterate, the unemployed and the under-employed, for being carried on in the context of limited resources, and for being efficient in terms of time and cost.

Clearly, attention given to designing new strategies for the development of this old and promising resource is

worthwhile. Through this series we seek to join hands with others who are attending to the development of non-formal education.

Cole S. Brembeck, Director
Institute for International Studies
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
1974

00009

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report may be regarded as a general introduction to the concept of non-formal education (NFE). This is so, even though what is said here rests upon a substantial base--that provided by the series of studies conducted by the Michigan State University Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education, as well as work done by a great many other institutions and individuals. Still, it <u>is</u> an introduction, just because, at this time, our knowledge of NFE, its character, its planning and its implementation, is still embryonic, tentative and provisional. It is only within the past few years that the notion of NFE as an instrument for the pursuit of recognized educational goals--particularly those associated with national development--has emerged and attracted support and study. Until quite recently, "education," in both developed and developing nations, simply meant "schooling." A variety of analyses, some economic, some political and some pedagogical, began to appear in the 1960's that suggested shortcomings and failures of schooling--at least of schooling construed as a single vehicle for education. The persuasiveness of such critiques resulted in a search for complements, supplements and alternatives to schools. That search was conducted across a broad front and involved people from a broad range of position and ideological posture. One of the places in

which the criticism of schooling found a firm footing was among scholars and institutions concerned with international development and assistance. It was within that community that the concept of NFE originated. Faced with clear demonstrations of the inadequacy of conventional, school-centered approaches to the educational problems of development, agencies and individuals began to advocate the utilization of out-of-school attacks upon the educational needs of developing societies. That advocacy, and the complex of programmatic strategies lumped under the rubric of NFE, formed the primary data base to which the descriptive and analytic efforts of the Michigan State Program of Studies (and similar efforts at other institutions) were addressed.

The problem was, simply, to study NFE, to organize it conceptually, to examine instances of it, to analyze its operation, its potentials and its problems. That has proven to be a complex and difficult task--so much so that it is probably fair to say that now, although we can surely say more about NFE than we could a few years ago, we realize that there is even more that cannot yet be said. As almost always happens, the intensive investigation of an area, particularly at the outset, reveals many more problems than it solves. And so these remarks make no claim to being firm conclusions, findings or definitive principles. Instead, they constitute an introductory analysis, drawn upon the slate of three years of study--study frequently marked by false starts and fragmentation. They must be regarded as subject to refinement, revision or rejection. All that is hoped is that they may establish a

platform for further development and for the continuing study of neglected and important dimensions of the total educational enterprise.

These comments are not intended as a summary or compendium of the studies conducted at Michigan State University. The series of studies are reported in seperate volumes, consisting of detailed, specific inquiries. Rather, the aim here is to provide an integrated discussion of the generalizations that emerge from the individual studies. The program of this report is to take a global view of the domain marked out by the concept of NFE, to try to organize and discuss that domain in terms that are both non-technical and brief. The organization and selection of material for this report is, of course, only one of many possible ones. It is based in the attempt to line out the subject of NFE in a way that may be useful to at least three categories of readers. First, there is a need for an overall introduction to the specialized literature on NFE that has been generated in the past few years--for a discussion that will allow the reader who is making his first contact with the field to focus his inquiry and to shape his expectations. Second, an integrated and systematic comprehension of the structure of the domain of NFE is at least a useful tool for practitioners who are concerned with problems of developing, implementing, evaluating and funding programs under the NFE heading. Finally, an overview of the area should be helpful to scholars who are interested in carrying forward any of the several lines of inquiry suggested by the concept of NFE.

Finally, by way of introduction, it should be pointed out that even within the Michigan State Program of Studies there is by no means a clear consensus on all of the questions that have been investigated. That lack of consensus is multiplied when work done by other individuals and institutions is taken into account. These comments, while incorporating all of those points on which there seems to be fairly solid agreement, are not limited to statements to which all students of NFE are willing to agree. Controversy is inevitable in any field of inquiry--otherwise the field would not grow--and this report is no exception.

Organization

There are, in general, two ways in which this report might be organized. One way--the one adopted--is to build the major divisions on perspectives or "levels" from which NFE may be treated. There are six of these: (1) the treatment of NFE as a concept; (2) the uses of NFE as an organizing rubric; (3) the delineation of some of the major empirical referrents of NFE; (4) problems of planning for NFE; (5) some major cautions in regard to NFE and (6) some important future directions for the study and application of the concept of NFE. The second organization strategy would base major divisions on some of the central topics and characteristics of NFE, as that concept has been analyzed in inquiry. Although those topics are not used here as basic categories, they do appear as cross-cutting dimensions within the several chapters. Under the different levels of treatment, there are recurring concerns--not

all of them appearing in every chapter, but all of them appearing with enough frequency to provide a linear unity to the "levels" analysis. These are topics that appeared again and again during the studies conducted at Michigan State and they represent, perhaps, the best construction we can now make of the central problems involved in the study of NFE. They are: (1) the relationship between NFE and the problems of development; (2) the relationship between NFE and the masses of people in the developing countries; (3) the relationship between NFE and the learning styles of its clients; (4) the importance of NFE to the need for flexibility in education; (5) the problem of learning evaluation in the context of NFE; (6) the problem of economic planning and evaluation in relationship to NFE; (7) the relationship between NFE and formal education and (8) the function of rewards and reward systems in NFE. These eight themes, treated with special reference to the problems of planning NFE and the practical issues faced by international assistance agencies, summarize the conceptual thrust of the studies conducted at Michigan State.

This report takes the form of a summary view of analysis and research and is not a review of research. It is cast in the format of an analytic essay and should be seen as a complement to, rather than as an index of, the several reports published by the Michigan State Program of Studies.

CHAPTER II

NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AS A CONCEPT

At its genesis, the idea of NFE was advanced as a very broad and loosely defined concept. It was, in a sense, a negatively defined notion--"all education that does not take place in schools." That is a fairly productive way to initiate inquiry, since it avoids the risk of overlooking important events by defining them out of consideration at the outset. Still, the simple "out-of-school" definition identifies a huge and amorphous field and does little to provide a means of discriminating among the data that make up that field. Given such a sprawling definitional mandate, a recurrent question is that of "what is NFE?" Or, in a more ideological tone, "among all out-of-school learnings, which ones are the most "non-formal?" These are, inevitably, murky questions. They were so at the beginning and, to a large extent, they remain so. In the large, there is probably not much wrong with just sticking with the out-of-school conundrum, particularly where research is concerned, and abandoning the search for a general definition of NFE. Put another way, at this point, the furthest we can progress toward conceptual clarity is to allocate the definitional problem to specific contexts--to regard the definition of NFE as a contextual or funtional issue. Simply put, this means that we do not look at NFE activities in a global way, hoping to identify defining characteristics, but ask,

00015

instead, on what grounds (in a given case) "formal" is being discriminated from "non-formal." In some contexts the grounds for discrimination might result in an activity being labelled "formal" while in another context, using different criteria of discrimination, a similar activity might be labelled "non-formal." The procedure of contextual definition can allow us to talk about NFE in specific contexts with a productive degree of clarity, while avoiding the scholastic debate about NFE "really is."

There are a great many bases on which contextual definitions of NFE may be constructed. The ones discussed here are parameters that appeared with some frequency during the Michigan State studies, but they do not constitute an exhaustive list. The set of distinguishing criteria do not, at this point, appear to be a conjunctive set--that is, it does not now appear to be possible to combine them in such a way that variation along one dimension will always be accompanied by a like variation along every other dimension. Perhaps the best way to treat them is as discrete attributes that may, in any context, be seperately assigned to the concept. The remainder of this chapter sets out a number of the possible grounds that may be applied to distinguish "formal" from "non-formal" education.

Administrative Affiliation

Almost all societies have, usually embodied in governmental arrangements, some agent or agency that is designated as having a primary responsibility for "education." These are, at national

levels, Offices, Bureaus and Ministries of Education and, at local levels, education officers and schoolmasters and teachers. These agents are, usually, quite visible. They are almost always associated with schools and, for the most part, their functions are rather well-delineated, widely understood and carefully circumscribed. In almost any social setting it is possible to ask "what is your educational system?" and receive a fairly complete and precise answer. (The better formulation of the question would be, of course, "what is your system of schooling?") This is so, despite the fact that we know very well that a great many agencies also conduct educational activities. One way in which NFE may be distinguished is to say that it consists of all those educational activities that are not discharged by the formally designated educational agencies. A further refinement may be added by limiting the application of NFE to all those "deliberate" educational activities not conducted in the system of schooling. This generates a third category--education that is not deliberate--which is sometimes designated "informal" or "incidental." In the contextual use of the administrative affiliation dimension, it is often clear that yet another refinement is in operation and we find the NFE label applied only to those out-of-school educational activities that, in their format, closely resemble school. The distinction, in these cases, has a great deal more to do with sponsorship than with education in general, since nearly identical programs might be discriminated between, on the grounds that one is school-sponsored and the other

is sponsored by business, another government agency, a church or so on.

Even though discrimination on the basis of administrative affiliation does not contain--especially in the last sense discussed above--any clear reference to educational practices, it is the basis that seems to be most frequently used. A very large portion of the NFE literature deals with "schoolish" activities that are sponsored by non-school agencies--vocational training, literacy, agricultural improvment and the like. The practical emphases of those cases usually center upon such considerations as cost, access to clients and efficiency of delivery, rather than upon pedagogical concerns.

Pedagogical Style

A very different dimension from administrative affiliation also occurs with high frequency in the literature. That is a distinction between pedagogical approaches that are highly "formal," rigid, teacher-centered and measured in terms of adherence to standards and those that are more flexible, that build upon the "needs of the learners" and tend to be measured in terms of client satisfaction. This is a distinction built on educational criteria, and need not be intrinsically related to the sponsorship of the activity. It is, of course, true, that there is probably a strong correlation between the frequency of "formal" pedagogy in schools and the frequency of "non-formal" pedagogy in out-of-school settings. Even so, the correlation is probably not strong enough to guarantee

the likelihood of a "fit" between pedagogical and sponsorship definitions.

Most contextual instances of definition of NFE utilize either administrative affiliation or pedagogical criteria, often in conjunction with one or more other criteria. (Some definitions combine both sponsorship and pedagogy, usually with unsatisfactory results.) These two categories of criteria may be seen to constitute two main "families" of definition for NFE. There are, however, several other sorts of criteria which, although usually related in one way or another to the two central "families," find their way into contextual treatments of the concept of NFE.

Function

Although the function of formal education is far from uniform from society to society, or even stable within a society, there is a strong central core of function that recurs in schooling. Whatever other functions schooling may have, it is almost always charged with basic cognitive learning--literacy, numeracy, general education--and with a relationship to the social reward system based in school-completion credentials. Another way, then, to discriminate between formal education and NFE is to regard as functions of NFE those educational activities that lie outside the recurrent central core of schooling functions. This basis of discrimination can easily be seen to be an ideological one, since implicit in it is the notion that only those functions that constitute the main thread of the school tradition are appropiate to formal education. Here, as

in the pedagogical case, there is some indication of a correlation between the functional criterion and the sponsorship criterion, since the conventional school functions are seldom treated outside a formal arena. The strength of that correlation, however, is open to serious question. There are, still, instances of contextual use in which a distinction based on function can be useful and it does appear in the literature, especially in discussions of the relationship between formal and non-formal education.

Clients

In most societies, even developed ones, formal education--especially at the upper levels--is a fairly elitist enterprise. Schools not only educate, they also screen people out, selecting their own continuing clientele. The result is the existence, in almost every society, of large numbers of people who are not affiliated with the official, formal educational agencies. Too, in some societies, ethnic populations or rural populations or populations remote from the cities may not be serviced by formal education and form other groups of "educational disaffiliates." Such disaffiliated populations are, almost by definition, potential clients for NFE programs and it is clear, in much of the literature, that the contextual use of the concept of NFE incorporates a disposition to use the attributes of the clients--especially the attribute of their educational disaffiliation--as a distinguishing criterion for the application of the concept. On this criterion, for example, such categories as "workers' education" become meaningful and fruitful. Here, as in the case of sponsorship

definitions, there is no clear relationship between the basis of discrimination and educational practices, although their is some reason to suppose that, especially for "screened-out" clientele, non-formal pedagogy might be more effective. Still, the magnitude of the problem posed, in all countries, by the educational needs of populations who lack an affiliation with formal education, makes a discrimination based on clients a frequent and useful one.

Reward Systems

As mentioned previously, formal education is, in most cases, associated with a particular kind of connection with the reward system of the society. That is, the rewards of formal education are usually generalized, rather than specific. They adhere in having gone to (or completed) school, rather than in the application of what is learned. (There is an important correlate of this, which will not be discussed seperately here. That is that, since the rewards of schooling are general, financing is often borne as a "social cost." Where the rewards of education are quite specific and learning-related, there is a strong tendency to assign the costs directly to the student and/or the employer.) In other cases of (deliberate) education, the rewards are immediate, specific and contingent upon what is learned--employment, better pay, higher agricultural yield. There is a fairly clear association between the nature of reward and the standard categorizations of formal education and NFE. In this case, however, the criterion (reward) is usually treated as an

accompanying characteristic of a distinction made on some other criterion, rather than as a basis for discrimination.

Cultural Congruence

Finally, a distinction is sometimes drawn on the ground of whether the general format of education is congruent with the modal learning patterns of the client population. We know that learning patterns differ in different cultural settings and that educational programs embody a particular set of notions about how people learn. The learning assumptions of education may "match" the culturally-given learning patterns of the clients or they may be quite different from them. There is some disposition in the literature to associate the concept of formal education with situations in which the educational program embodies a learning model that is unlike the indigenous one and the concept of NFE with situations in which the learning models are congruent. This is especially the case when the context is one of educational contact between literate educational programs and semi-literate or illiterate populations. (The distinction has little force when the client population is literate. If applied, for example, to middle class American schools, which serve a population in which the general learning style is almost identical to that of the school we would get the curious result of designating the American school as an example of NFE.) Although this distinction requires a fairly special context, it can be, in some cases, a reasonable and productive one.

In summary, it is clear that there is no single "right" way to define the concept of NFE. Instead, definition must depend upon context, with the selection of the dimensions along which formal and non-formal are to be distinguished reliant upon the purposes for which the definition is being constructed. It is probable that research demands a somewhat different selection of criteria than does implementation and that a concern for administration, funding or program design might find criteria to be most useful that would be relatively fruitless for a teacher. What is important is not the selection of one class of criteria rather than another, but that the criteria selected by appropriate to the task at hand.

It may be that, over time, a clearer picture of the most productive construction of the concept of NFE will emerge. We may, for example, discover the strength of the correlations between variables in the sponsorship "family" and variables in the pedagogy "family." (That would seem to be an important task for future development of theory.) Until that time, however, the best course would seem to be the careful articulation of what basis, in a given case, we are using to distinguish between formal and non-formal education, along with the limitations we intend to place on our stipulated usage. It is clarity and consistency in our treatment of the concept that is most at issue, rather than the effort to stake out an ideological claim for the correctness of any one of the many plausible definitions.

The conceptualization of NFE needs to comprehend a substantial range of possibilities--perhaps even ones that cannot easily be related to the two definitional "families" discussed here. At least as important as this is the need to begin the treatment of the concept with a clear foundation of purpose. The question of what education is trying to do, what it is for, forms the backbone of contextual definition, rather than the question of what NFE "is." In dealing with NFE as a concept, we need to start with a notion of the task at hand, much as a toolmaker must know what the job is before he can design the tool. The introduction of the concept of NFE shows us that this approach to educational thinking is reasonable--it exposes the possibility of alternatives. We can act as toolmakers, and not just as tool finders who are limited to doing whatever jobs can be done with found tools. The next chapter deals with some of the possibilities toward which the concept of NFE directs our attention.

CHAPTER III

THE VISUALIZATION OF POSSIBILITIES

In any human enterprise, the range of possibilities that we are able to visualize is dependent upon the things we include in our thinking. We know very well, for example, that people who are unaware of--who do not think about--material opportunities have difficulty visualizing a materially better life for themselves. It is only when they encounter information--through travel or contact with media--that they alter their expectations and actions. The "revolution of rising expectations" is a revolution built upon the introduction of new objects of thought; objects that expand the visualization of possibilities. In this chapter we will consider some of the ways in which the introduction of the concept of NFE can expand our ability to visualize educational possibilities. The idea that our educational thought is not necessarily bound to the model provided by schooling is an explosive idea. Problems and prospects that have received only peripheral or passing attention are revealed as genuine possibilities. Practices and limitations that are built into the schooling model are seen as subject to alteration. Once the "blinders" of schooling are removed, the notion of "education" has a broader--a more complex and richer--reference. We begin to see the educational dimension of activities that have not been regarded as "educational," and we begin to notice that a great many people than we had previously thought are, in fact, "educators."

00025

It is, perhaps, this explosive potential of the idea of NFE that is the most dramatic consequence of systematic work in the area thus far. Although we may have difficulty in saying what NFE is, or in saying exactly how it should be handled, it is clear that the world of education is larger than we have usally thought it to be, more laden with possibilities than we had imagined. The power of the concept to direct our attention in new directions is considerable, and the topics listed here do not exhaust the possibilities. They are, however, important and frequently encountered ones. They are presented here as possibilities that are often "hidden" by the conventional format of schooling, but we should keep in mind that our eventual goal is not so much the development of a two-tier approach to education--formal and non-formal--nor the substitution of non-formal for formal education, but the integration of all forms and residences of education into a more comprehensive and unified view of learning and its relationship to human action and aspiration. What the concepts of "formal" and "non-formal" have in common is education and, in the final analysis, that is what counts most.

The World of Out-of-School Learning

We are well aware that schooling, even in developed countries and even within those populations that get the most schooling, makes up only a tiny fraction of the total learning that constitutes a person's "education." Indeed, when the learning processes by means of which people come to adapt to their life situations, to survive and progress, is seen in its totality, it is clear that most of the

most important things we learn are learned outside, rather than within, the school. For most of us, the learning dimensions of getting a living are outside the school framework. We acquire our systems of "values" outside the school, our capacities to live with our fellows, to participate in political processes, to manage our economic lives and to identify ourselves as members of cultural groups. These learning activities are so diverse that it is probably impossible to give a satisfactory overview of them, but they possess a few textural commonalities. First, out-of-school learnings are responses to the demands of immediate situations, rather than projected responses to imagined situations. We learn a job because we have been employed to do it or because there is an immediate prospect of being employed. We learn social behavior because we need to function effectively in the social groups of which we are members and political participation because we are faced with the need to make political judgments. These learnings are rooted in participation, rather than in preparation. Second, there is usually a clear and recognizeable relationship between out-of-school learning and rewards. If we master a job, then we receive the rewards of doing the job--salary, position, food. Third, out-of-school learning usually takes place in an activity format--it is, to use a cliche, "learning by doing." Fourth, all of these characteristics combine to give out-of-school learning a quality of continuous evaluation. The proximity of out-of-school learning to needs, rewards and activity makes it both possible and

imperative to maintain a constant checking of results. Learning and evaluation always take place in a cycle--a period of learning followed by an evaluation. In schooling, the cycle has a very long period (and sometimes the evaluative point in the cycle is omitted entirely.) In out-of-school learning the length of the cyclic period is short, sometimes incorporating immediate feedback. This allows for rapid adjustment of learning behavior, based on evaluative data. In school settings it is not uncommon, because of the length of the cyclic period, to find evaluations that have no effect in the adjustment of learning. That is why, in regard to schooling, it seems sensible to say, "I studied that, but I didn't learn it." Given the way in which learning and evaluation are intertwined in most out-of-school learning, to not have learned something seems equivalent to not having studied it.

These textural properties of out-of-school learning are not, of course, uniform. Some instances of out-of-school learning are further removed from need, reward and activity than are others, and the period of learning-evaluation is longer in some cases than in others. Still, in most of the events we might identify as NFE, these characteristics are more prominent than they are in formal education. What is at issue here is the realization of the possibilities and problems of dealing with education in highly immediate learning environments, of comprehending the rather dramatically different world of out-of-school learning.

Changing Goals of Development

One of the most persistent facets of the literature of NFE is its central relationship to the alteration of ideas about what development is and how it is best pursued. Indeed, it is fairly accurate to say that the idea of NFE is the result of the need to develop an educational strategy for the pursuit of development goals that differ from the conventional ones of straightforward economic growth and political stability. This is because, for better or worse, formal education has been so deeply embedded in a particular model of social and economic progress that it is very difficult to extricate it and put it to use in different approaches to social and economic change. To cite one example, the classic model of economic growth through the construction of a capital surplus for industrial investment requires the identification and education of managerial elites and that task has, historically, been a major function of formal education. If, however, the notion of development gives priority to distribution of wealth over the accumulation of investment capital, then there is a concommitmant need for educational approaches that aim more at the development of the overall educational level of the society than at the production of educated elites. A shift of emphases in the notion of what constitutes development requires a shift in the educational correlates of development. One way to attack this problem is to reconstruct our conception of formal education. (This was, for instance, the strategy adopted by American

Progressive Education early in the twentieth century.) Another way--the one that has, by and large, been adopted by the development community--is to cast the search for different educational models as a search for alternatives to formal education. This approach reveals a great many possibilities that remain obscure in the schooling model and allows for the construction of educational aspects of development imperatives on an uncluttered base. It does run the risk of setting formal and non-formal education against one another, but that risk is rooted in the question of whether changed notions of development are treated as an expansion of conventional approaches or as competitive with conventional approaches. However that question is resolved, the fact remains that the possibilities of NFE are intimately associated with a reconstructed notion of what development is and how it should be pursued.

Distribution

One of the major blind spots that results from the equation of education with schooling is the presumption that only those who are identified as "students" are learning. This excludes most people for most of their lives. The result is that education as a "social good," (with the costs borne as social costs) is crudely maldistributed. Although the distribution of economic wealth remains the primordial problem of most societies, there is an increasing awareness that the general problem of distribution includes more than simply wealth, that it is important that other varieties of goods be distributed with a maximum degree of equity. Leisure,

pleasure, health, information and education are, increasingly, viewed as goods on which every member of a society has a claim. Indeed, it is not unusual to find analyses in which the distribution of non-economic goods is seen as a prerequisite to the achievement of of economic equity.

Formal schooling is a costly and, usually, rigid, format for educational distribution. It excludes large numbers of people--everyone for most of their lives, some for all of their lives--just because to extend the formal format is financially and pedagogically impossible in even the most developed countries. What is needed, if the problem of distributing education as a good is to be attacked, is to expand the methods by means of which education is distributed. This problem, and its centrality in the development of the concept of NFE requires that excluded populations be identified and that their educational needs by explicated. This is a major turn in thinking about education, since the formal model typically identifies needs not in terms of the client but in terms of the needs of the socio-economic system for educated personnel. If equitable distribution of education as a social good is to be accomplished then the question of client needs and the problem of access to excluded clients becomes critical. One of the most interesting and exciting impacts of the concept of NFE is the questions it raises about the needs of clients excluded from the formal system and about ways of linking those clients up with the total educational enterprise of the society.

Strategic Uses of Formal and Non-Formal Education

When we equate education with schooling, we are likely to assume that whenever an educational need is identified we have only to devise an in-school approach to the need and install a program in the school. We ignore pretty completely the question of what the "best" environment for the accomplishment of a particular educational goal might be, since the environment (the school) is given. When, however, we introduce NFE as a possible alternative to formal education, it becomes both reasonable and important to ask, of any proposed educational task, what arena will best serve to fulfill the task requirements. We can ask what sort of delivery agent is best suited to the task, what pedagogical style best fits the task and what sort of sponsor and financing arrangements are most appropriate to the task. This opens up a broad vista of possibilities (and poses some complex problems of analysis and design.) It suggests, for example, that at an early stage in educational planning an effort should be made to identify as many potential locations for an educational function as possible. It suggests, too, the importance of a comparative analysis of possible consequences of choosing one location over another and admits, in such comparisons, the possibility of identifying not just degrees of expected accomplishment of the task, but possible environments in which total accomplishment of the task is a reasonable expectation. This would be a major departure in educational thought, since the formal model inevitably settles

for partial accomplishment, at least in the case of those tasks for which it is an ill-suited model. Given the possibility of making strategic choices between different educational formats, the search for an "ideal" format takes on an increased theoretical plausibility.

Flexibility

Typically, formal programs of education become stable, often ritualized, elements of culture. They are invested with a particular cultural vision and are the repository of the "values" that make up that vision--the vision of the "educated man." These values have great persistence over time and enjoy an honorific status in culture that makes them relatively immune from critical analysis. As societies become more complex and pluralistic, the scope of the vision of "educated man" increases and schooling becomes longer, more expensive and, in regard to its central values, more inflexible. The result is a formal system of great rigidity, incapable of making rapid adjustments to changing social, economic and technological conditions. The inflexibility of deeply engrained formal systems is at the heart of many recent criticisms of schools in both the developed and developing countries. At the same time that schools become inflexible and come to dominate our conceptualization of "education," the pace of change in other sectors of society is increasing. Communications and technological change combine to accelerate alterations in economic and social life and those, in turn, generate dramatic demographic and political shifts. The

upshot is a global condition of rapid and profound change in the absence of instruments for meeting the challenges of that change in flexible and adaptive ways. There is a pressing need for educational approaches in which great flexibility is possible--approaches that allow for experiment (and permit failure,) that can be easily refined and adapted, that look more to the future than to tradition for direction. We can, of course (and should) make the effort to break down the rigidities of formal education in order to convert it into a more flexible tool, but those rigidities are stubborn and, perhaps, rest themselves on some important human needs--the need, for example, to maintain connection with persistent notions of what human values have real and enduring worth. It is almost certain that, whatever modifications we may be able to work in the character of formal education, there is, and will continue to be, a need for the recognition and support of educational contexts in which flexibility is a feasible dimension.

Much of the literature in NFE makes it clear that the achievement of flexible approaches is a primary hope for NFE. Many of the best cases of NFE are small-scale, highly specific, very flexible programs. They represent, in a way, laboratories, constructed at a micro level, in which the macro problems of societies may be subjected to analysis and experimentation. The introduction of NFE as a component in our educational thinking exposes possibilities for flexible design and evaluation that are, at best, enormously difficult to pursue in formal settings.

Formative Evaluation

Everyone recognizes the importance of evaluation, whether of education, investment, fertilizer or worker productivity. It is a commonplace that any educational program should have a built-in evaluation and that evaluation should provide a data base for constant revision of programs. In fact, while evaluation is almost a universal in educational practice, it does not figure very importantly in the reassessment and redesign of formal programs. There are a number of reasons for this. First, evaluation in formal systems is applied to the client, rather than to the system itself. What we wish to discover, for the most part, is the ranking of individual learners in comparison with either his peers or with agreed upon norms. The revision impact, if any, falls upon the learner. Second, the periods over which evaluation takes place in formal systems are typically quite long. In their most binding form--the school-leaving certificate and the diploma, by the time evaluation occurs (by the time one class leaves the system) a whole set of new clients have already progressed some way along through the system and revision in the light of evaluation becomes very difficult. Third, the "educated man" bias of formal schooling places the ultimate evaluation in the adult-life activities of the learner, where the discrete effects of formal education can no longer be isolated for inspection. Finally, the entrenched character of formal education makes it resistant to alteration and there is just not much interest in using evaluation for purposes of

systemic revision. The idea of evaluation that is undertaken for purposes of revising and refining educational practices is basically alien to the concept and practice of formal education. That sort of evaluation, here termed "formative evaluation," requires different kinds of contexts in order to play a significant role in educational planning.

The experimental and investigative quality of NFE, at least to this point, provides a fruitful context for formative evaluation. Indeed, NFE seems to demand a formative dimension to evaluation, since there remain so many questions about program effectiveness that are unanswered and since the central thrust of NFE is toward securing a closer fit between educational function and educational environment. Furthermore, many non-formal programs are sufficiently specific and of sufficiently short duration to allow for fairly precise and frequent evaluations, both in terms of learner performance and program performance. Finally, the frequency with which NFE programs build upon the concrete needs of the learners and display a direct relationship to reward produces a climate in which the learners can see clearly their own stake in program evaluation and increases the likelihood that the learners will insist upon the evaluation of the program.

It is not surprising that formative evaluation, so long neglected in formal education, should emerge as a strong current in NFE. Here, as in so many other cases, possibilities that are obscured in formal education are revealed or become imperatives under the organizing influence of the NFE concept.

Financing and Accounting

Formal education, as it has evolved in its pedagogical and cultural forms, has also developed modal and characteristic forms of financing and accounting. Almost all formal education takes place under the sponsorship of some distinct and controlling agency--the state, local government, churches and so on. Typically, the sponsor provides facilities, collects monies for whatever the major source of revenue for the sponsor is (taxes, for example,) frequently combining those funds with clear and distinct payments provided by the learners (tuition costs) and disperses the money under a fairly uncluttered system of accounting. That approach, while it may be quite complicated in its mechanics, especially in large systems, is fairly straightforward in its assumptions. The sources of funding are few and easily identified, the categories of expenditure are limited and costs are easily determined and quantified. It is, in part, the clarity and uniformity of financing and accounting assumptions that leads us to by so impressed with the costliness of formal education.

When we begin to look at activities under the NFE rubric, however, it quickly becomes apparent that the conventional approaches to financing and accounting are inadequate for NFE and the need for other approaches is great. We find, for example, that many activities, labelled for purposes of financing and accounting as, say, "agricultural development" or "health services," have major educational dimensions that are neither financed or accounted as

"educational costs." We discover, too, that education involves a great many "hidden costs," such as foregone income, that do not usually get included in educational accounting procedures. We become aware that NFE demands accounting systems of considerably greater comprehension and sophistication than those used for formal education. We notice, too, that there are other modes of financing education than the conventional ones. Funds earmarked for education can be allocated to other than educational agencies, funding can be provided to cover "hidden costs" and so on.

The refinement of financing and accounting approaches that appears as a possibility as a consequence of the introduction of the NFE concept also contributes a more comprehensive attack upon the difficult. but important, problems of fitting educational costs and impacts into a general view of economics and national development. One of the reasons that approaches to economic evaluation and planning that seek to incorporate "social factors" are so difficult to develop is that it is hard to isolate inputs and outputs of "social factor" systems with the necessary degree of precision. The kinds of cost and benefit analyses suggested by NFE can move the search for comprehensive economic theories a little further down the road.

The economic problems associated with NFE are among the most complex and stubborn, and it should not be supposed that they are close to being resolved. They are not, and probably will not be for some time. What is the case is that the study

of the economics of education, like the study of pedagogy or evaluation, benefits from the expansion of our conceptions provided by the notion of NFE.

Teachers

In formal education, the concept of "teacher" is remarkably stable and persistent. The teacher is a recognized, usually formally credentialled, agent of the sponsoring agency. He is the representative of the sponsor, invested with the authority of the sponsor. He has usually received some specialized training for teaching and shapes his behavior in accord with the culturally embedded construction of what is teaching is. He is constantly a teacher, operating on a different level from that of the learners and possessed of different mandates and purposes. Teaching, in formal systems, is an occupation, with all the entailments that accrue to identification of an activity as an occupation. In NFE, however, it is not uncommon to find that the "teachers" do not fit the formal model. In some cases they are people whose occupations are something other than teaching, who teach intermittently during their pursuit of their occupations, or "part-time," outside their ongoing job, usually "teaching" their job skills. They are sometimes not identified as "teachers," but as supervisors, health workers, extension agents and so on. They usually have no specific training in teaching as such and are likely to shape their teaching behavior more nearly in terms of what they know about what they are teaching than in

terms of what they know about teaching. They are often peers of the learners, sharing common goals and cultural assumptions and, in those cases in which they have some other occupation, their authority and status is likely to rest upon their performance in, and the sponsorship of, their occupation. What matters, in the case of a health worker, is the level and quality of health services, not the performance on examinations of his clients.

The concept of NFE suggests an expanded and enriched vision of who teachers are and what their qualifications might be. It frees the idea of "education" from a tyranny imposed by a uni-dimensionsal notion of what a "teacher" is and allows us to examine and support the educational efforts of a wide array of people who, despite their not being identified as "teachers," perform vital and significant educational tasks.

Comprehensive Learning Systems

Discussions of education in a given society almost always pay some lip service to the fact that learning takes place in many locations and throughout the lifetimes of learners. Those discussions, however, usually pass by the examination of that fact and go on to talk almost exclusively about schooling. This is, to some extent, understandable, since, historically, we have not done much to systematize and describe education that takes place outside of the school. While we have been aware that the total education of a person takes place in a complex network of learning environments. and that that comprehensive network

is provided by social and cultural institutions, we have not had the conceptual and analytic tools necessary to rendering a useful description and understanding of total learning systems. The concept of a total learning system has, until recently, been applied only in such special cases as residential schools and institutions for learners with special characteristics, such as blindness or mental retardation. The largest reason for this has been the visibility and stability of the school, coupled with the variety and amorphousness of out-of-school learning environments.

The concept of NFE provides an umbrella under which the out-of-school components of comprehensive learnings systems may be submitted to organized and systematic inspection. What has happened, in the study of NFE, is the expansion of systematic inquiry into education into activities that have, for the most part, escaped detailed analysis. The first expansion, understandably, has involved the recognition of the most visible components of comprehensive learning systems, such as vocational training, instruction in agricultural improvement and non-school literacy programs. A second expansion is the delineation of the educational component of activities that are not primarily educational, but in which the educational dimension, when it occurs, is reasonably visible. This is the case in such examples as health services, family planning, marketing process and so on. Another expansion, not yet very well developed, would involve the identification of the educational component in highly complex and integrated environments, such as family and social

life, in which "education" is not readily visible, since it is so subtly enmeshed in a multi-dimensionsal context.

Although no one can claim to have developed an adequate inquiry model for the description of comprehensive learning systems, the partial models we have now--models such as the education sector review--are more comprehensive and sophisticated than that provided by the equation of education with schooling. Work on the concept of NFE makes an important contribution to our awareness of the possibility of identifying comprehensive learning systems and adds to our ability to understand the rich and varied tapestry that is education.

Summary

What has been suggested here is that the introduction of the concept of NFE into our thinking about education substantially has expanded our willingness and competence to visualize educational possibilities. If the emphasis on NFE does nothing more than to free our educational thought processes from the constraints that are integral to the schooling concept, it will have done a great deal. For far too long we have limited our vision and our imaginations to a restricted and confined conception of what education is and how it is to be conducted. We have ruled out many sources of variety, experimentation and richness and have sacrificed much flexibility and diversity. A major thrust of the literature in NFE has been the "demythologizing" of educational thought--the recognition that schooling is only one of a probably infinite array

of educational possibilities, one tool among many, well-suited to some tasks, but ill-suited to others. What has been done so far is only a beginning in the lengthy process of reformulating our educational assumptions and many of the possibilities presented by the concept of NFE are still only dimly seen. A continuing concern for NFE should be the exploitation of the capacity of the concept to expand and enrich our vision.

CHAPTER IV

THE FACES OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

The discussion thus far has dealt with the conceptual reference of NFE. We turn now to a consideration of the characteristics of some of the empirical instances that fall clearly under the concept. There is not much to be gained by looking at cases in terms of whether they "are" or "aren't" instances of NFE, but it is useful to consider what the persistent qualities are of programs that are clearly recognizeable as cases of NFE. That approach centers around the search for guidelines that can suggest what the most appropriate and fruitful applications of the procedures and practices of NFE may be. The assumption is that there is some wisdom that operates in the selection of NFE contexts and that the existence of a non-formal approach is some evidence for its own appropriateness. This assumption cannot be pushed too far, since selections can, certainly, be made on grounds that have little or nothing to do with appropriateness. It is surely the case that a formal model is often chosen not because it is appropriate but because the appartus for formal education is well known and available. Still, if we can identify some major uses of NFE that may provide a helpful tool for understanding more clearly what is potentials are.

There is a growing literature of descriptions of NFE programs, ranging from small, highly specific programs of the sort reported by Sheffield and Djieomoah from Africa to the comprehensive programs reported from The People's Republic of China and Tanzania. Collections of descriptions are organized functionally, as in the Case Studies report of the Michigan State Program of Studies, and nationally, as in the instance of the sector review in Ethiopia. There are reports of literacy programs, agricultural development, health and family planning education and occupational training from the highly informal training of craft workers to massive industrial training programs such as SENAI in Brazil. At this point, generalization from cases is hampered by two qualities of the descriptive work. First, there is little consistency of descriptive format, so that different descriptions are built along very different dimensions. There has been some progress in the development of descriptive models (the Michigan State case studies and the Ethopian sector review are examples) but comparison and generalization is difficult in the absence of carefully articulated categories of description. Second, most of the descriptions contain little evaluative information, and much of that is impressionistic and not comparative. Evaluations tend to be enthusiastic, which is understandable, but over the long term we need sober and restrained evaluations that may yield a solid data base for saying what approaches and contexts seem to work best. Given these difficulties, generalizations about the appropriate applications of NFE must be regarded as highly

tentative. Nor can those generalizations take the form of saying with detail and precision what the best models of NFE are. First of all, there is not much evidence for supposing that we understand the educational process in general or NFE in particular sufficiently to allow for the construction of anything more than highly abstract and fairly crude models. Within the study of formal education, which has a long history or work done on a context in which the variables are rather clear and fairly limited, the effort to construct precise and detailed models has met with little success and even model building at a high level of abstraction remains a controversial and infant field. Second, when we talk about the uses of NFE in the LDCs we are talking about contexts that vary enormously, both between and within countries. Those variations in context are the basis for the long-standing admonition to guard carefully against unwarranted assumptions of program transferability. That admonition is a sound one and should be taken seriously by scholars and planners. Finally, the client-centered character of much of NFE almost assures that client populations will have their say in what programs look like and that the interests of clients--about which we may know very little--may alter dramatically any models that we seek to utilize.

What is attempted here is neither a comparative and taxonomic study of descriptions nor the articulation of a set of models for NFE. Rather, the effort is to identify situational conditions in which NFE programs have been implemented with some frequency and

some degree of reported success. It should not be supposed that NFE is applicable only in the fairly restricted sets of conditions discussed here, nor that NFE is always applicable in similar conditions. What is at issue is the further sharpening and focusing of our notions of what the best uses of NFE are.

There are a number of program attributes that occur with some frequency in NFE programs. This discussion is limited to eight attributes that, while they are not common to all NFE programs and while no single program is likely to possess all of these attributes, seem to be central enough and frequent enough to justify, at least provisionally, the view that whenever several of these conditions obtain, the appropriateness of NFE is probably strong enough to warrant its consideration as an educational approach. The eight attributes are these: (1) NFE is often adopted as an educational strategy when educational needs are formulated as a response to immediate and pressing demands of economic and social conditions. (2) NFE components in total educational strategies are frequently recognized in comprehensive national and regional development programs, such as Comilla in Pakistan. (3) When identified client groups include large numbers of the poor, NFE approaches are often seen as appropriate. (4) NFE has wide and frequent application in occupational training programs. (5) NFE is frequently utilized in cases where there have been recent and dramatic changes in economic, demographic, technological or ecological conditions. (6) NFE is seen to be an appropriate approach in situations where there are

00047

existing structures that, while not overtly educational, are in place and functioning and capable of being adapted to educational purposes. Such structures may include cultural structures, structures that provide access to target client populations and external structures that pursue other than educational functions. (7) NFE has been utilized in many cases in which educational needs can be clearly defined in uni-functional and short-run terms. (8) In cases where there is a need for educational support for some non-educational activity, NFE is often viewed as a fruitful educational strategy. Now let us consider these qualities of NFE in more detail, with special attention to the reasons why, in the sorts of situations described here, NFE is so often regarded as a plausible strategy.

Responsive Education

It has become a habit of social thought to define social and economic needs in terms that include an educational component. There is substantial justification for that habit and even if there were not, it is so much a part of our intellectual furniture that it must be taken into account. Those who seek to improve their position and their advocates call not just for economic justice, but for educational and cultural justice as well. The efficacy of education as an instrument for betterment is an article of our contemporary faith. In many cases the demand is for equity in schooling, but in many other cases it is not. When educational needs and demands are identified and when they are accompanied by the rejection of or the recognition of the impracticality of

a schooling response, the plausibility of turning to NFE as an alternative strategy is clear and obvious.

There are several reasons why educational response may be cast in an NFE format. First, in most countries, expenditures for formal education are very nearly at the limits of tolerability. To respond to demands for educational equity with formal schooling would, quite simply, bankrupt many national economies and severely dislocate many others, including many developed nations. Any response, in those conditions, has to be one in which the educational component is integrated with other programs so that multiple benefits, including, if possible, ecomomic progress, will accrue. Other factors, such as geographic isolation, unavailability of personnel and so on may also serve to make formal education impractical. A special, but frequently important limitation on the practicality of formal education occurs when educational demands originate for populations where the language of formal education is short supply. It is not uncommon for formal education to utilize a different language than that used by most of the population. Thus, it is not unusual for demands for education to originate in situations where formal education is just impractical as a response mode. Second, in many cases the need for education is immediate and urgent and the laborious process of gearing up and implementing a formal response is not adequate to the case. Typically, the "pay-off" of formal education is located several years in the future and that model is simply unacceptable in many

instances. In addition, formal education has, historically, been implemented from the "top down," and has no strong tradition of fast, demand-based response. Finally, newly identified and articulated educational needs are usually made against the backdrop of national efforts to implement formal education and are usually, at least implicity, requests for measures that will fill voids left by formal schooling. This means that implicit in the identified need is the requirement for a different response--just as the persistence of a pain when one has been taking aspirin implies the need for some different medication.

These and other reasons converge to link NFE with situations in which there are recently identified educational needs. While we may adopt formal education as an alternative when need identification has not yet taken place, when there is a strong imperative for responsive education, planners and practitioners have, in case after case, devised approaches that fall clearly and unambiguously under the domain of the NFE concept.

Comprehensive Development Plans

Many of the best instances of NFE, both currently and historically, are those that are component parts of comprehensive development schemes, especially those that are regional and those that structure total development efforts around the problems of rural areas. Indeed, many of the most successful development programs fall in the category of rural/regional schemes. Typically, such programs are built around increased agricultural productivity,

with attention to the necessary support systems for increased food production, including transportation, health services, nutrition, marketing, agricultural technology, financing, power and, of course, education. (There is, as well, in most instances, attention to the standard of living of the rural populations.) These many dimensions are incorporated in an integrated plan for geographic regions and populations that possess, in themselves, a degree of regional and/or ethnic integrity. (Comilla has been mentioned and there are plans of this sort in Ethopia, Brazil, the Mekong River Valley and in other places. Both Tanzania and Cuba are at least near examples of this approach in the context of a small country and an excellent historical case is provided in the U.S. by the Tennessee Valley Authority.)

There are several reasons why NFE is well-suited as a strategy for the educational components of comprehensive development plans, especially those of the rural/regional sort. First, the idea of comprehensive planning leads to the identification of a wide range of possibilities, including educational ones. That idea, like the concept of NFE, has an expansionary impact on vision. Charged with the mandate to look at development comprehensively, planners can hardly avoid noticing the range and variety of educational activities that are not located in schools. Second, the typical patterns of population dispersal, coupled with limited transportation networks mitigates against the utilization of standard formal format, since that format calls for the aggregation of client populations in

centralized facilities. Third, the typical situation for rural and regional development contains several of the other attributes listed here as attributes of situations in which NFE tends to be chosen as an educational format--the populations are usually poor, they are not affiliated with the formal system of education and the educational dimensions of the development plan are usually derived pretty directly from production and occupational concerns. Fourth, agriculture historically has been a stronghold for NFE. The learning of agricultural practice has never found a firm footing in formal schools--even in places where agriculture has a place in the school curriculum there are usually exceptional conditions, such as joint sponsorship with agricultural agencies, special arrangements for teacher approval and so on. By and large, the learning of farming has been at most a highly non-formal affair and most often has taken the form of father-to-son transmission with occasional assistance from outside agents such as extension officers, demonstration farmers, landlords, equipment and agricultural product salesmen and the like. Finally, it is often necessary in this sort of development program to address educational problems rapidly, whether or not the population is literate (as it frequently is not.) There is neither the time nor, for many purposes, the necessity to establish literacy, which is the sine qua non of formal education. Most of the educational techniques that are adaptable to illiterates are fairly emphatically non-formal. It is reasonably clear, then, that in comprehensive plans, NFE should be given serious consideration as an educational strategy.

The Context of Poverty

When we look at a wide range of programs that fall under the concept of NFE we must be struck by the fact that a large proportion of the clients are poor--both the rural poor and the urban poor, especially, in the latter case, the urban poor who are recent immigrants to the cities. (This latter category is a world-wide phenomenon that poses social and economic problems of enormous magnitude.) There is no need to repeat here a description of the plight of the poor, since there is, now, an ample body of literature that shows clearly the extent of poverty and its appalling costs in terms of the quality of human life and, all too often, in terms of mere physical survival. The notions of wealth and poverty have, today, perhaps the most central place they have ever attained in economic and social analyses and the problems of the poor attract more intensive, more sophisticated, well-informed and sympathetic attention than they have ever done. That does not mean that the problem of poverty is close to being solved. Indeed, it sometimes appears that it grows worse. Still, the issue of wealth and poverty has become a central--perhaps the central--theme of social concern and planning. Although the problem is far from resolution, there are few people, rich or poor, who take comfort any longer in the view that the poor will be always with us. What is at issue here is not the comprehensive problem of poverty, but the fact that NFE has been adopted as an educational strategy for the poor with a high degree of frequency (and with some success.)

There are a great many reasons why NFE is intimately associated with poverty and an analysis of those reasons can give us considerable help in understanding the potentials and applications of NFE. There are, first of all, two reasons that, while rather self-evident, deserve mention, since they point out that some of the explanation does not rest in the characteristics of NFE as such, but in the statistical and political shape of the world. First, given the application of the concept of NFE mainly to the problems of the developing world, it is inevitable that a large share of the clientele should be poor, just because it is in the developing countries that the poor are concentrated. In many countries they constitute such a large percentage of the population that only narrowly elite educational programs could avoid the inclusion of large numbers of poor. Second, the present social and political awareness of the centrality of the problem of poverty, which is world-wide, acts to assure that any program of social, political or economic reform will pay special and substantial attention to the problem of poverty and the NFE movement is no exception. There are, however, a number of more directly intrinsic relationships between the characteristics of the poverty situation and the characteristics of NFE. Let us examine some of those relationships in some detail on the warranted presumption that no set of relationships is more critical to our understanding and utilization of NFE.

Education for the Masses

For at least a century educational thought and practice has been shaped by the problem of mass education. The general idea has been that the educational face of progress consists of two expressions. One is education for the development of leadership elites--the "growing edge" of social, political, economic and technological development. The other expression recognizes that the gap between the "growing edge" and society generally cannot be too great if developmental opportunities are to be exploited. It seeks, then, a raising of the general level of enlightenment accross the total society. It is this latter expression that is the conceptual foundation of the idea of mass education. Put another way, elite education historically has centered upon the provision of large increments of change in small numbers of clients, while mass education has been concerned with small increments of change for large numbers of people. How to pursue these divergent goals and how to balance them equitably and fruitfully is a major theme in both the theory and practice of education. That theme is as relevant to the emphasis on NFE as it always has been to formal education. The problem of mass education deserves careful scrutiny by those interested in NFE--a fact which is evidenced by the employment of the NFE concept in attacks on the empirical problem of mass education.

Until very recently, the problem of mass education in the developing countries has been analyzed and approached through the application of generalizations drawn from the experience of the

developed nations. Those generalizations accepted an approach in which the goals of both elite and mass education were pursued within the context of formal education, despite the fundamental incompatability of those two educational imperatives. The doctrine of the common school runs persistently and centrally through most analyses of what education has been in the developed nations and what the relationship between education and progress has been. In recent years, however, there has been a strong countermovement to the doctrine of the common school, one that treats that doctrine as a myth that is badly in need of correction. Some recent inspections of the history of education in the developed countries, taking a revisionist tone, have argued (convincingly, in the opinion of this observer) that, while formal education in the developed countries has done a reasonably effective job of elite education, it has failed fairly dramatically in its pursuit of mass education. This argument is buttressed by a large body of recently compiled research data on the relative accomplishments of common education for the elites and for the masses. That research, typified by James Coleman's study of the comparative benefits of schooling for black and white Americans, suggests with considerable force that the formal model is, and always has been, fundamentally concerned with elite education. Further support for the revisionist view comes from the realization--dramatically set forth by Phillip Coombs--that formal education is simply too costly to serve as vehicle for mass education. It does not seem excessive to say that we are now

witnessing the emergence of the internal contradictions that were built into formal education by the inclusion within a common format of the aims of elite and mass education. The dominance of formal education by the ethos and practices of elite education has rendered that model relatively useless for the pursuit of the traditional aims of mass education--the general elevation of enlightenment and the attainment of small increments for large numbers of people. What, at one time, appeared to be a reasonable prospect for formal education--its utilization as an all-purpose educational format--now looks much more like an artifact of fortunate economic conditions. The prevalence of the common school in the history of the developed nations seems more a product of their ability to afford a basically inefficient system than of the power of the common school to serve both elite and mass interests.

The force with which this realization has come about in recent years and the strength of its evidential base has had an inevitable consequence. It has directed and focused concern for mass education on a search for alternatives to formal schooling. It has comprehended the fact that, especially in poor countries, the attempt to pursue mass education through formal schooling has had, as its major result, the exclusion of vast numbers of people from almost all of the benefits of education--at least that education that is borne as a social cost. The consequences of that exclusion and the search for alternatives has irretrievably allayed the concept of NFE with the goal of mass education and, in the developing countries, mass education implies education for the poor.

The Consequences of Neglect

There are a number of consequences of the educational neglect that contribute to the plausibility of NFE as an educational strategy particularly well-suited for mass education. Let us consider three of them. First, the exclusion of the poor from formal education has not meant that there has been no education in the mass context, only that education in that context has been accomplished by other than formal means. If we wish to learn about alternative structures for the support of education, one of the best places to look is in places where there are few formal structures available. This topic will be dealt with in more detail further on. Here, what is important is the recognition that the exclusion of the poor from formal schooling has the inevitable result of the development of alternative educational systems. Second, the historical failure of the schools to meet mass needs results in a deep-seated distrust of formal education by the poor. (It should, of course, be recognized that this attitude is always ambivalent, since the school, while of little utility for the immediate problems of the poor is also, in its elite function, one of the few available roads out of poverty. The relationship between formal education and the poor is, emphatically, a love-hate relationship.) This means that the acceptance, by the poor, of educational programs often depends upon the disassociation of those programs from formal education. Third, the long-term exclusion of the poor from formal education results in the absence,

among the poor, of the linguistic and conceptual prerequisites of success in formal education. Formal education embodies certain habits of thought, a common language of instruction, a context of literacy and so on. It assumes the possession of a fairly large number of traits by its clients. In the absence of those traits it is apt to achieve very little. The frequency with which the prerequisites of successful schooling are missing in poor populations adds to the attractiveness of NFE programs that do not incorporate those prerequisites to success.

The Structure of Need

If we look at the tradition of schooling we can identify a fairly circumscribed set of needs to which formal education has been addressed. They include literacy and its concommitants, introduction to traditions of knowledge, the development of cognitive skills and so on. What should be recognized about the conventional need structure of formal education is that these are needs that assume a degree of affluence for their emergence. They become functional needs only after more basic needs for food, shelter, income, distribution, production and health are satisfied. Historically, formal education has assumed a clientele that has already a well-developed system for the satisfaction of basic survival needs. For the poor, however, the most pressing needs are precisely those that are not far removed from the most basic terms. Most of the energies of the poor are expended in the tasks of survival and the use of what surplus energy

there is is often dictated by the need to structure social, political and cultural practices in ways conducive to dealing effectively with economic realities. Put another way, the poor are, necessarily, more deeply concerned with the brute economic foundations of life than with the notion of "development and progress" that animates the elite function of formal education. Formal education has no tradition of dealing with needs so close to the economic fundament, no real means of building the prerequisites on which it rests. To expect formal education to provide for its necessary economic base is rather like expecting a mechanic to also be a miner, a smelter and a manufacturer. More sensible, and more attractive, is the attempt to develop alternatives, such as NFE, that have a greater capability for responding to the educational dimensions of the needs of the poor.

A discussion of the relationship between NFE and the context of poverty lays bare many of the reasons for, and the potentials of, the current emphasis on NFE. It reveals most of the major factors that seem to govern the selection of NFE as an educational strategy and points up the fact that, despite the status of NFE as a recently advanced catch-phrase, its reference is to a tradition that is as old as culture itself, its relevance to an educational problem--mass education--of considerable antiquity. Most of what remains to be said in this chapter is subsumed by the relationship between NFE and the context of poverty and is, in a real sense, a further detailing of that theme.

Occupational Education

Despite the claims of apostles of leisure, work remains the dominant dynamic in the lives of most people. The acquisition and conduct of a job is the central fact of life for at least all of those who, in accord with the criteria of particular cultures, are identified as potential workers. Given the profound demographic and technological shifts of the past few decades, old patterns of job acquisition and job learning have broken down and the problem of employment has moved to the center of the policy and planning stage. As that has happened, the problem of occupational education has taken on broader significance. There are many constructions of that problem, ranging from the view that the needed educational response is for "career education," a life-long process of skill and attitude development beginning in the very early years, to the view that, for most jobs, on-the-job training, conducted in an informal way, is adequate. The best truth, as it usually does, probably lies somewhere between these poles. All that we need to suppose is that, in most societies, there is at least some substantial need for occupational education, in order to raise the question of what approaches are most appropriate to that need. Since occupations vary so greatly in regard to their prerequisites for success, it is probable that a fairly wide range of approaches is needed to accomplish a workable program for the development of occupational skills. Since that is so, it is not surprising that, for many occupational skills, NFE

should be adopted as an educational strategy. It has already been mentioned that many kinds of economic and occupational needs have never had a strong place in the formal tradition, and in those cases it is always prudent to explore the possiblity of other vehicles, such as NFE for the pursuit of those needs. There are, as well, some other attributes of occupational training that seem to be strongly associated with a preference for non-formal modes.

First, formal education emphatically is dominated by an emphasis on cognitive, as against manual, skills. Even in instances where manual skills have been treated in a formal context they have had the status of "poor relations," whether the treatment has been within a comprehensive, common school framework or within a framework of seperate "tracks" or systems. The elite function of formal education is based on cognitive learning and manual skills are assigned to those who are rejected from the cognition-dominated formal system. Manual education in formal systems has also been burdened, usually, with the excess freight of "general" or mass education. The disabilities of formal schooling in the case of manual skills creates a situation in which alternative approaches have an intrinsic attractiveness and in which non-formal measures have demonstrated considerable success.

Second, NFE appears as a potent approach whenever the skills of an occupation are possessed by people who are excluded from, or disaffiliated from the cultural context of formal education. This is dramatically the case in regard to agricultural skills, and it is true as well of a wide array of other occupations,

00062

including much of manufacturing, many service occupations, political occupations, indigenous crafts and so on. The transmission of skills from skilled practitioner to apprentice practitioner in these cases is very difficult to assimilate into a formal system, with its traditional patterns of teacher selection and its historical commitments to cognitive and literate approaches to learning.

Finally, many occupations have a dimension of clear and direct benefit to the consumer of educated manpower--a benefit that is distinguishable from the general social benefit that accrues to employment. Industrial training programs benefit industry in a pretty unambiguous way, just as farm labor training benefits landholders. In cases of occupational training that directly serves the interests of a distinguishable private (or, in some cases, public) agency, there is a tendency to make that occupational training the responsibility of that agency. This means, at least in terms of a sponsorship definition, a tendency to identify that sort of occupational education as NFE.

There are, undoubtedly, other factors that do conduce to a close association between NFE and occupational education. Much occupational education, for example, has the attribute of response, and much of it takes place within the context of poverty. These are, however, three important aspects of occupational education that serve to associate it with the concept of NFE and it is reasonable to suppose that where manual skills are involved, where occupations skills are possessed by disaffiliates from the main

body of formal education, and where employers stand to benefit directly from occupational education, NFE deserves priority consideration as an educational tool.

Contexts of Rapid and Recent Change

We are all impressed with rapidity and depth of change--change in technological capabilities and practices, change in the political sphere, change in communications and, on a somewhat different level, changes in demography--population increase and relocation and ecology--depletion of resources, climactic shifts and so on. As widespread as change has become, we know that it happens with varying rates in different situations. It is a never a uniform process, and those situations in which change is most rapid and most profound demand special attention. That attention, in most cases, has to take the form of a diligent search for new solutions and approaches to new problems. We are aware of the "spread" of effects from even simple innovations, such as road systems or the introduction of radio and of the tremendous complexity of massive innovations, such as wide-scale political reform or industrialization. Dealing with problems of change requires innovative response and experimentation by social institutions on a large and varied scale. The experimental possibilities exposed by an emphasis on NFE has already been discussed, and it is this possibility that results in the frequency with which NFE approaches to educational problems are encountered in rapidly changing contexts.

Existing Structures

One of the obvious disabilities of formal education is the cost and effort involved in instituting formal schooling in cases where it has not previously been used. A reasonable approach to this disability is to examine the educational potential of structures that already exist in situations where a deliberate educational effort seems important or necessary. It is often to possible to utilize existing structures in order to carry forward educational tasks without the costs and disruptions that are inevitable in the construction of a formal system. There are several sorts of existing structures that can be (and have been) exploited for their potential for NFE. Let us consider three broad categories of possibly useful existing structures.

Alternative Educational Structures

The absence of formal education does not necessarily mean that there are no educational systems in place in a situation. A great many sorts of agencies--agricultural extension, health, nutrition and family planning agencies, labor unions, farmer co-operatives, commercial firms, mass media, churches, may already be active in a social context, carrying out educational programs related to their specific function. They may possess a considerable amount of educational skill and may (but not always) enjoy a positive relationship with their clientele. (The sorts of structures intended here are, of course, representatives of

external agencies and the problem of their relationship to the population is always a critical one.) When there is an educational capability, it is sometimes possible to expand or modify the educational activities of structures of this sort and to adapt them to different (or, more usually, additional) educational tasks. NFE takes this course fairly often. Perhaps the best case is the adaptation of mass media, especially radio, to the purposes of social, political and agricultural education. There are other cases in which agricultural extension or health services have been employed for literacy education and so on. The utilization of existing educational structures is one of the most promising applications of the concept of NFE.

Access Structures

A slightly different case is presented by structures that have no very direct educational dimension. Transportation systems provide an excellent example, as do systems of distribution of goods--stores, markets, pick-up and delivery systems and so on. (These systems do, of course, work to shape the habits and thought patterns of those with whom they come in contact, but they are neutral in terms of deliberate education.) They represent, however, a possible educational resource, if ways can be found to turn them to educational purposes. Although there are not many cases of NFE programs that adopt utilization of access structures as a central strategy, there are many suggestions in the literature that point out the potential of such structures. Not only do

structures of this sort have direct utility for education, they can also provide simple access to isolated or deeply disaffiliated populations, whether the educational programs that are plugged into such pipelines are of a formal or non-formal sort. And, in many cases, the lack of adequate access is the major stumbling block to educational distribution.

Cultural Structures

We come finally to a category of existing structures that tantalizes but, for the most part, eludes, workers in NFE. Those are the indigenous structures that constitute the cultrual apparatus of populations, particularly populations of the rural poor. They are, for the most part, difficult for external agents to identify and fairly conservative in their activities. (We know, for example, that in peasant villages the individuals who might be identified as "progressive" are usually outsiders in the indigenous culture that dominates village life.) It is not unusual for indigenous culture to carry a substantial educational load--often as a parallel and competing force to externally-based education. Given this, idigenous culture has a considerable expertise and capability in education and the employment of that capability for other than traditional educational tasks is a possibility of enormous interest. Here, as in the case of access structures, the literature in NFE contains more speculation about the use of cultural structures than it does examples, although the identification of "opinion leaders" and "demonstration

farmers" that is a long-time staple of agricultural extension does provide one important case in point. As we advance in our understanding of both NFE and idigenous culture, it is reasonable to suppose that this possibility will be more frequently and successfully exploited.

Ad Hoc Education

An examination of examples of NFE yields, as one of several interesting generalizations, the suggestion that the frequency with which NFE is employed is positively correlated with the precision with which educational needs are defined and stated. More specifically, NFE seems to emerge in cases where education is limited to one or a few clearly stated and understood functions and where the life-span of an educational effort is short and conclusive. This sort of education--education for a single purpose, here termed "ad hoc education" seems to be especially well-suited to non-formal approaches. The reasons for this are fairly obvious, and, like many of the other points discussed here, they inhere in the traditional character of formal education. Schools are, typically, multi-functional institutions, organized under such undiscriminated rubrics as "general education," "preparatory education," "vocational education" and so on. Too, schools are organized around large time blocks--the smallest are grade levels of a year, the largest are blocks of six to eight year "schools." The format of schooling is not easily adapted to highly concrete and specific, short-term educational efforts, while, in case after case, NFE has shown a

rich capability for those sorts of efforts. This is not, of course, to say that the application of NFE is, or should be, limited to ad hoc education, but only that when conditions seem to call for specific, limited-duration programs of education, then NFE is a promising possibility as an educational strategy.

Supportive Education

For the most part, formal education is a full time activity, for both learners and teachers. Students "go to school," and they are "students," whether the context is primary education in Ethiopia or university education in England. There are, however, a great many educational tasks that require learning in support of some on-going activity. The farm laborer must learn his job, but he must also get in the crop, and, typically, his learning takes place within the confines of his work. The peasant housewife needs to learn nutrition, but she also needs to continue to prepare meals for her family and to meet her other responsibilities--she cannot just abandon those responsibilities for a time while she goes to school. Much of what is needed by way of supportive education is already managed through on-the-job training, "informal" education and so on, but there remain instances in which it is important to introduce education without disrupting the flow of continuing activities. A large number of NFE cases take just this form--intermittment attention to learning, with learning integrated into the fabric of some non-educational activity. NFE

represents a sort of "half-way" step between the totally situational learning that is sometimes termed "informal" or "incidental" education and the completely removed format of formal education. What is involved in supportive education is the design of sequences in which activity and education alternative in flexible and short-term periods, with education taking its almost exclusive direction from the problems that arise in the activity itself.

Summary

This chapter has attempted to shape generalizations about the applications of NFE that, in light of reported NFE practices, seem most prevalent and promising. It is not, of course, an exhaustive listing, but it does represent a reasonably complete set of conditions under which, at least at this point, NFE seems to be a reasonable and appropriate strategy. It is a provisional answer to the question of when we should give serious attention to the NFE option. In brief summary, NFE can be regarded as a possibly fruitful option (1) whenever responsive, supportive or ad hoc education seems to be called for; (2) in the contexts of comprehensive development schemes, poverty, or rapid change; (3) where education for occupations, especially those involving manual skills, skills possessed by formally uneducated practitioners, or skills of direct benefit to employers are involved or (4) in contexts where existing structures have a high potential for adaptation to educational purposes. Most of these applications

of NFE are directly related to deeply engrained and stubborn characteristics of formal education. Most of them are implicit in the conceptualization of NFE given in previous discussions. And all of them are supported by numerous examples in the descriptive literature of NFE.

CHAPTER V

PLANNING FOR NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

The ultimate goal of the study of NFE is practical, even despite the substantial theoretical interest of the subject. Once we have some grasp of the domain of the concept and have tried to exploit the possibilities of vision that the concept marks out; once we have given some attention to the appropriate uses of NFE, we need to consider the problem of how to go about implementing it. We need to consider the planning of (and for) NFE.

It would be pleasant to be able to say that the study of NFE has revealed one or more fairly definitive models of planning and implementation--that we now know some reliable recipes for success and how to avoid failure. Pleasant as that might be, it is not feasible at this point. This is partly because most studies of NFE, to this point, have been either conceptual or descriptive and partly because the range of NFE is so varied that unitary models of planning are probably not reasonable goals. Given this latter qualification, it is of the utmost importance to note that, whatever general guidelines are advanced for planning NFE, the best approach to planning remains planning on a case by case basis. It is probably impossible to emphasize this point too strongly, especially to planners, who because of their assigned tasks, are disposed toward fitting a variety of planning efforts into one or a few standardized models. There is little justification

00172

for standardization on the ground of what we know about education generally, and even less on the basis of our present, fairly limited knowledge of NFE. For now, and for a long while in the future, planning for NFE must be context-dominated and problem-centered, just as the most effective planning for formal education begins with problems in their context and moves from there to the development and testing of programs. (This is not, of course, to say that problem-centered approaches are common in formal education. They are not, and that is but another irritating trouble with schooling. It would be a pity if NFE were to duplicate the tendency of formal education to devise programs with little or no attention to problem or context.) There are, however, a few remarks about planning for NFE that should be made.

In general, the problem of planning for NFE is not dramatically different from any other planning problem. It involves the careful identification of problems, sensitive assessment of the total situation, the construction of as wide an array of options as possible, the design of programs around the most promising of those options and the testing and revision (in the light of testing) of those designs. There are, however, a few special characteristics of NFE that have importance for planning--characteristics that are implied in what has been said previously. Let us look at a few of those.

Two Views of Planning

The very range of the NFE concept (and its variety in practice,) coupled with its freedom from the traditions that so often govern planning formal education, presents the possibility for optional approaches to planning that are pretty much non-existent in school settings. In formal education, there is seldom a choice between imposed design and emergent design, since the tradition of schooling dictates an imposed design. In NFE, that choice is not only available--it is critical. Given the flexibility and responsiveness of NFE, it is almost always possible to go into the situation in which education is to be introduced and, working with the human and material components of that situation, build an educational design "on site," allowing the design to emerge from and within the educational activity itself. Most of the uses of NFE discussed in the previous chapter will lend themselves to an emergent approach to planning. In many cases, especially those in which the learning and valuational configuration of the clients are somewhat obscure, an emergent strategy may be preferrable. It may also be useful to take an emergent perspective when the educational response is to dramatically altered conditions. At any rate, the choice is almost always available and while there is no clear reason to hold, as some are inclined to do, that only emergent planning is suitable to NFE, the choice should be made carefully. In general, the choice rests upon the state of our knowledge about the context and the clarity and precision with which educational goals have been

formulated. The less we know, the more seriously we should consider the adoption of an emergent posture toward planning. Let us look a bit closer at these two views of planning, realizing as we do that, since imposed design is the norm of formal education, the characterization of imposed design given here may be appropriate to both formal education and imposed design NFE. Emergent design, however fruitful it might be in formal education is, from a practical perspective, almost exclusively limited to NFE applications. These are not, of course, intended as hard and fast principles of planning, but as general guidelines that distinguish between imposed and emergent designs along dimensions in which they show substantial differences.

Review Processes

Any planning begins with review, with an assessment of what the parameters of planning are. There is variation, however, in how review is conducted, mostly in terms of the objects of inspection that figure in review. In some cases, the objects of review may be global and fairly abstract. This is so when review centers upon such objects as national or regional productivity, large-scale investment policies and potentials, political (state) structures and so on. Review, in this case, looks for commonalities, large organizing principles and high-level generalizations. In other cases, review may begin with concrete objects, seeking to discover what the nature of the terrain is, what particular pieces are and how they may be related to one another. The difference is not unlike the difference between beginning a drawing with a large outline and

filling in the detail and beginning a drawing with small units and building up the whole. In a cliche, the difference is between moving from the general to the particular and moving from the particular to the general. Both methods of review have appropriate uses, determined by the nature of the problem toward which planning is addressed and conditioned by our understanding of the problem area. If we wish, for example, to equalize educational achievement through some such approach as allocation of funds, we would be well advised to adopt a global review policy, looking for norms of achievement, determinants of achievement and so on. If, on the other hand, we wish to accelerate the learning of a particular student, we would probably need to start with a careful inquiry into as many of the concrete attributes of that student's behavior as we could identify. In general, global review is appropriate for planning for large-scale changes that can be expressed in simple, easily quantified terms. Concrete review is appropriate to planning for changes that are complex, that are aimed at limited sectors of society and that are difficult to quantify, requiring careful attention to often impressionistic assessment. Global review is the starting point for the construction of imposed designs, while concrete review is the starting point for emergent design.

Size

We often overlook the role of size in shaping our planning procedures. Size is a simple thing, its impact varies from activity to activity and we are victims of a mythology of progress

in which, since bigger is better, size is seldom seen as a constraining variable. (We are just beginning to outgrow that mythology--a healthy sign for both planning and social theory.) Size is, however, relevant. Some things are possible in contexts of large size that are not possible in small units and vice versa. A full orchestra can produce sounds that a string quartet cannot, but a string quartet can achieve greater flexibility than can an orchestra. In general, the larger the context of planning, the more difficult it is to plan from the perspective of emergence and the more appropriate imposed design becomes.

Reward Systems

A critical dimension of planning is the relationship between programs and reward systems. Human beings remain human beings and the degree and quality of their participation in activities and programs is contingent upon their anticipation of reward and the degree to which promised rewards are forthcoming. (This is an especially critical issue for NFE, since formal education is so clearly identified with a potent system of rewards.) In general, rewards can be seen as direct or indirect. Consider, for example, the indirect character of the rewards of schooling. The reward lies not in the learning of what is learned, nor in its immediate application to the learner's life problems. Instead, the reward--substantial as it is--is located in the future and accrues to the highly abstract quality of "having an education." On the other hand, in the case of health or nutrition education, the rewards

of improved health and strength are quite immediate and very directly linked to the learning. Since emergent planning rests upon a comprehension by the participants of what is at stake--otherwise they will be unable to participate effectively--emergent planning is most suitable in cases where the linkages to the reward system are clear and direct. In the case of indirect linkages with reward systems, the possibilities of reward must be subjected to careful planning attention and, in that event, planning for imposed designs has substantial plausibility.

Evaluation

Two approaches to evaluation were discussed in a previous chapter--evaluation that is comparative and scalar and evaluation that is made on the basis of accomplishment or failure. Since imposed designs are fairly inflexible and, in their basic assumptions, not subject to formative evaluation, it is almost always necessary to construct the evaluation component of imposed designs on comparative and scalar terms. We ask not if a person has learned 'x' but how much of 'x' did he learn in comparison with his fellows or how much of 'x' he learned in comparison with standard rates of acceptability. In planning for emergent design, however, given the proximity of that sort of planning to the base of actual operation, it should be possible to build in evaluation measures that can be used formatively and that make assessments on the basis of clear cut success or failure. The location of the design process in the context of activity should

allow for sufficiently small units of activity that each unit can be evaluated immediately and, if the outcome is unsatisfactory, measures can be taken to redesign the unit until unitary success is achieved.

Pedagogical Authority

In imposed designs, pedagogy is imposed upon the learning situation. The learners are expected to conform to the pedagogical model that is built into the design and the source of pedagogical authority is some construction of "method." Methods, on this view, are constructed out of knowledge about the learning process in general and tested against that body of knowledge. In emergent designs, however, it is both possible and desirable to look to the modal learning style of the clients in order to devise pedagogical approaches that are congruent with that learning style. The authority for pedagogy rests more clearly with the learner than with method. Here, again, we may notice the appropriateness of imposed designs in cases where there is substantial knowledge of the context of planning--where there is basis for assuming that the learning style of the clients will be compatible with the designed method--and the appropriateness of emergent planning in cases where there are serious gaps in our knowledge of the clients.

Costs

The calculation of costs for educational programs is an exceedingly difficult proposition. It is simplified to a degree when cost variables are limited to sponsor expenditures and client fees--a fairly standard method of computation. This sort of accounting is about all that is possible when planning aims at the construction of designs to be imposed, since the shape of other cost factors are contextual and outside the review capacities of the planning process. (It should be noted, of course, that it is sometimes possible to estimate other costs on the basis of cost studies of similar programs.) In emergent designs, however, it is more feasible to conduct a comprehensive assessment of costs, checking the scope of hidden or widely variable costs, in order to incorporate a more refined cost analysis into the design.

These, then, are some of the major planning decisions that, in addition to generally accepted principles of planning (which have been so often articulated that there is no need to repeat them here) figure in planning for NFE. In planning for NFE, options are available that do not figure in planning for formal education--principally, the option to plan designs to be imposed on learning situations or to build educational designs within the context of the learning situation. In general, the construction of designs to be imposed is associated with global review processes, programs of substantial size, reward systems in which the relationship between learning is deferred and indirect, evaluation that is comparative and

scalar, pedagogical authority derived from method and costing patterns that are limited to visible expenditures of sponsors and clients. Planning that allows for the construction of design within the learning context is associated with concrete approaches to review, small programs, direct linkages to reward structures, evaluation schemes that are formative and based on success--failure, pedagogical authority derived from the clients and comprehensive cost analysis. Again, there is no intention here to approve one planning pattern over another, but only to point out that differences in approaches to planning call for different constructions of the variables considered here.

It is to be hoped that, as analysis progresses and cases of NFE accumulate, we will be able to say a great deal more about planning. For now, however, a highly systematized approach to planning must remain a hope. All we can do is to utilize what tentative guidelines we possess and persist in treating each case in terms of its own unique attributes.

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

An essay of this kind should pay some attention to both problems and speculation about the future of its subject. There are, to be sure, a number of problems that remain unresolved and the future direction of NFE will rest importantly on how those problems are resolved. Some of the hopes for NFE that animated its early development have proven to be shaky at best. On the other hand, study and development in NFE has exposed prospects and possibilities that were not clearly anticipated in the beginning. Let us consider--briefly and at a fairly speculative level--what some of those prospects and problems are.

Mobilizing an Old Resource

Even though the label of "non-formal education" is of fairly recent origin, most of what it refers to is old and well-established. If we use the formal--non-formal--informal continuum as historical categories it is clear that a huge preponderance of human learning has taken place in non-formal and informal settings and that more deliberate education has been within a non-formal than a formal context. Although quantification is still imprecise, it is reasonable to believe that even in countries with well-developed school systems, today the division between formal and non-formal efforts is roughly equal. There is nothing new about NFE. All

00082

that is new is the term and an increased clarity of focus on it, coupled with an expanded willingness to support NFE and to try to mobolize it for new or extended purposes. Perhaps one of the difficulties in studying and planning NFE is that the reference is to a class of phenomenon to which we are too close. NFE is something that most of us do much of the time as a matter of course--it does not have the clear identity that formal education has, and to try to talk about it is, sometimes, a little like a fish trying to talk about the water. There is a tendency to suppose that, when a new lable is advanced, it must name something new and quite different from anything in our experience. (This tendency is exacerbated by the further tendency of people who are close to the new label to adopt, as a strategy of professional and academic protectionism, the invention of obscure and arcane jargon and complex taxonomies.) One of the sad aspects of educational history is the frequency with which fads appear and disappear, while practice goes on pretty much as before. A major problem for NFE is the maintenance of the recognition that what it names is not, in fact, very novel and that the most significant promises of NFE lie not in the construction of new educational structures, but in the employment of an ancient resource to accomplish things that are difficult or impossible to accomplish in a formal setting, to extend education to those excluded from formal schooling, to expand the range and improve the quality of education by utilizing existing structures and to furnish a fertile ground for vital experimentation and evaluation.

The best applications of NFE do not involve political wrangling among competing agencies nor the creation of flashy new programs, but the patient effort to begin with available educational resources and to make those resources more responsive, more systematic and more easily adapted to basic and recurrent human needs.

Education that Serves

We have surely had enough of educational approaches whose advocates champion their potentials as broad-range panaceas for almost all and any social and economic problems. Indeed, the current disenchantment with formal education rests importantly on the zeal with which educators have articulated the capabilities of schooling, since those capabilities have so seldom been actualized in practice. It is long since time for more modest approaches to education, for an abandonment of panaceas, for a search for educational modalities that respond to and serve the interests of mankind. We can simply no longer afford the arrogance that has so often pervaded educational thought and planning nor the inflated and largely mythic view of education as a driving engine of progress. We have allowed our view of education to become divorced from reality and therein lies both a major problem of and a rich promise for NFE. We must struggle against the possibility of removing from contact with the basic structure of human interests those sorts of educational measures that have had their invention and status precisely in that kind of contact. Difficult as that struggle is, it is assisted by the very

character of NFE, its proximity to the masses, its emphasis on concrete and specific goals, its involvement with the participants, its incorporation of clear and direct rewards. It is difficult to look at the primary clientele of NFE--the poor, the excluded, the disaffected--without realizing that the pressing needs of those clients are much closer to the bone of human existence than to sophisticated and leisurely cognition. Given that realization, it becomes obvious that the need is for education that serves, in a modest and supportive way, the search of people for a better life. It is not surprising that that perspective on education, including the radical critique of schooling in the West, the "de-schooling" movement and the emphasis on NFE has, in all cases, looked to alternatives to schooling for instruments of education with a high potential for service.

Complements: Formal and Non-Formal Education

One of the major problems of NFE lies in the possibility that NFE may be established as a competitor to formal education--that the climate of study and practice may become one of jurisdictional warfare between two categories of "educators." This is not an easy problem to avoid. It is likely, for example, that this report may be interpretted, by formal educators, as "hostile" to formal education. That is probably inevitable when one of the recurrent themes of NFE is the filling of voids left by formal education and response to problems for which formal education has seemed to be inadequate. That thematic quality focuses concern not on the

successes and legitimate potentials of formal education, but upon its failures and limitations. Still, it should be recognized somewhere that formal education has produced a large number of solid accomplishments and that, however NFE or other alternatives may develop, there remains, and will continue to remain, a substantial role for formal education. It is likely, for example, that the education of leadership elites is best approached through formal education, as is the preparation of professionals. Too, it appears that universal literacy in a society is intrinsically associated with the presence of extensive formal education. We need a balanced and comprehensive view of education that makes allocations of funtion to formal and non-formal modes on the basis of the likelihood of accomplishing what we wish to accomplish. NFE and formal education are probably true complements, each having characteristics that conduce to their appropriateness to some educational tasks but not to others. The question of what the range of appropriateness of the two modes is has permeated analysis and research on NFE and, although we have come some distance in understanding that question, and are now able to make some tentative responses to it, it remains one of the most complex and important issues in the NFE field. What is clearly revealed in NFE study and practice is that, for some sorts of educational needs, there are better responses than schooling. What is not so clearly shown, since it has not been taken up as a central task, is that there are other tasks that are, probably, most appropriately lodged in formal settings. Perhaps the latter

task is one for formal educators, but however the problem of strategic uses is attacked, it should be on the grounds of mutuality and articulation between formal and non-formal modes and not on the grounds of an attempt to replace formal with non-formal systems.

Educational Costs

We are all aware of the enormous costs of formal education, and that awareness has produced a deep-seated hope that NFE may provide less expensive educational modes. To a degree, that hope is well-grounded, especially when accounting follows standard procedures. In another sense, it is probable that, given more comprehensive methods of cost accounting, there will not be much difference between NFE and formal education. What does appear to be the case is that NFE opens up possibilites for funding and support that disperse costs in different ways. The problem is to find ways of cost allocation that are maximally equitable, rather than to simply find cheaper educational modes. It is, perhaps, the issue of equity, more than the issue of gross costs, that makes formal education seem such an expensive proposition. Formal education, borne as a total social cost, too often benefits only a few. The problem of wastage, about which much has been written, is as much due to time spent in formal systems by people who derive little or no benefit from it as it is of inefficiency or poor planning. One of the brightest promises of NFE is the possibility of developing patterns of support and funding for

education that distribute costs on a firm basis of benefit, with both cost and benefit defined in more comprehensive and sophisticated terms.

Although it may appear to be a question-begging platitude, one is led to the conclusion that both the problems and the prospects for NFE are great and open-ended. There is much yet to be known, and what we do know points in a number of promising directions. We need to know a great deal more about the characteristics of NFE and about how to mobilize those old resources without distorting or destroying them. Still, the central involvement of NFE with traditional structures increases the likelihood that we will learn some of the things we need to know. We need to be able to conceptualize education as a servant to immediate human needs and the thrust of NFE thus far has placed a heavy emphasis on just that sort of conceptualization. We need to be able to integrate and articulate a wide variety of educational approaches into comprehensive and fruitful learning systems, linking cost with benefit and controlling, to the largest possible extent, wastage and inefficency. The study and analysis of NFE seems to hold considerable promise for achieving those very difficult goals. We need, in sum, to continue to apply what little we know in fruitful and productive ways and to carry forward the effort to know more.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Let us conclude with one more look at the major themes that emerge from an inspection of research and analysis of NFE. Most of those themes were present at the introduction of the concept and most of them will continue to occupy a prominent place in study, planning and practice. Perhaps the most useful consequence of the three years of study conducted at Michigan State University has been the identification and clarification of those issues that lie closest to the heart of NFE and the elaboration of a reasonably useful conceptual apparatus for the further development of both the concept of NFE and the events and practices to which it refers.

At the leval of conceptual analysis, we have noted that, while the concept of NFE marks out a fairly clear field in distinction to formal education, it does not, itself, provide clear grounds for characterizing that field. That characterization remains very much dependent on context and is most appropriately conducted on a case-by-case basis. There are at least two major, and not fully compatible, approaches to definition, one centering upon sponsorship and the other upon pedagogical format. The selection of definitional mode must be made on the basis of function and the major imperative is for clarity of stipulation in definition and not in the adoption of any single definiton.

00089

An important impact of the concept of NFE lies in the power of the concept to expand our ability to visualize educational alternatives. It sharpens our ability to comprehend the world of out-of-school learning and provides a conceptual vehicle for considering the educational dimensions of changing goals of national development. The concept of NFE is directly and intimately associated with the problem of distribution of education as a good. As an emphatically experimental context, the issues of educational flexibility and formative evaluation are reasonable possibilities in non-formal contexts, as is the question of alternative approaches to financing and accounting. NFE identifies a much larger notion of who, in any society, are the teachers, and makes real the possibility of thinking about education in terms of comprehensive learning systems.

Practice in NFE points toward a number of characteristic applications. Some of the most important applications are to: situations in which education is a response to a demand originating in the context of the learners; comprehensive development schemes, especially those that are designed for rural settings; education addressed to the needs and life situations of the poor; occupational education; single purpose and short-term education, situations of rapid change; situations in which viable structures for education already exist, and situations in which educational services are needed in support of other activities.

The planning process for NFE involves choices between options and presents both problems and promises that are not usually available in the planning of formal education. NFE can employ a planning approach that builds up plans from the concrete situation, building upon direct rewards and clear service to the immediate needs of client populations. It is possible to explore, through NFE, the complementary relationships between formal and non-formal systems and to use NFE as a context for the development of more precise and equitable formats for financing and accounting.

Finally, the concept and practice of NFE introduces into our educational thought a much-needed modesty and restraint. All of the characteristics of NFE discussed here combine to conduce toward the subversion of arrogance and certainty, leaving us less confident of our "knowledge," but, hopefully, more honest in our wisdom.